

Strategic Committee on Postsecondary Education
Minutes
November 18, 2002

The Strategic Committee on Postsecondary Education met November 18, 11 a.m. (ET), in room 149 of the Capitol Annex.

The following members attended: Walter Baker, Joe Barrows, David Boswell, Bob DeWeese, Ed Ford, John Hall, Marlene Helm, Crit Luallen, Vi Miller, Sue Hodges Moore, Gerald Neal, Charlie Owen, Allen Rose, Jody Richards, Richie Sanders, Johnnie Turner, Charles Whitehead, and David Williams. Members absent: Steve Barger, Jeffrey Hoover, David Karem, Dan Kelly, Harry Moberly, Governor Patton, Bob Stivers, and Greg Stumbo. Norma Adams chaired the meeting.

Academic Program Productivity and Institutional Collaboration: Jim Applegate, vice president for academic affairs, Council on Postsecondary Education, and Bill Brundage, commissioner, Office for the New Economy, made the presentation.

Mr. Applegate began the presentation. Without accessible, productive, and high-quality academic programs connected to the needs of the state, the value of enrolling and graduating more students is reduced as well as the ability to contribute to the many partnerships with state agencies, such as the Office for the New Economy. The work in this area has been designed to ensure that Kentucky students leave college having learned what is needed to be prepared for life and work in Kentucky.

In 2000, 1,310 existing programs in the postsecondary education system were reviewed. Minimum levels of productivity for these programs were established in terms of the number of students graduating and the number of students being taught. As a result of the analysis, 596 programs fell below the threshold of 12 undergraduate degrees produced per year.

- Work began with the institutions to close or improve programs below the threshold. There have been two rounds of productivity review. The institutions either designated for closure or began to make significant changes in 420 of the 596 programs: 173 actually being closed and the rest being changed. For example, multiple programs were collapsed administratively and structurally to work together more effectively to recruit more students at considerable savings in the administration of those programs, funds were reallocated toward more teaching, and program content was changed.
- Academic audits of how institutions create new programs also occurred. Institutions established guidelines for creating new academic programs. Those were reviewed and campus visits were made. Reports with suggestions for institutions to use for improving the new academic program approval processes were developed and the institutions responded positively. A council-administered

Web-based system was created where development processes are posted and conversations can begin.

- More programs tied to the needs of the state are being created. Most are in computer and information technology, health-related disciplines, education, public safety, business, and technical programs such as automotive engineering and aviation engineering.
- There are over 60 collaborative institutional programs sharing faculty and other resources to increase access, quality, and efficiency.
- The statewide engineering strategy began with existing programs at UK and UofL who in turn partnered with WKU and MuSU to create more undergraduate programs in engineering.
- Public health collaboration has involved the faculties at ECU, UK, UofL, and WKU who have come together and created a common curriculum.
- The KCTCS and the four-year institutions have collaborated and created teacher quality/teacher education 2+2 programs where students are recruited into the teaching profession in the KCTCS and move on, without loss of credit, to complete their programs at the four-year institutions.
- A deaf interpreter program between ECU and UofL has increased the number of deaf interpreters in the state.
- An on-line telecommunications program among MuSU, with its program of distinction in telecommunications, the Kentucky Virtual University (KYVU), and the KCTCS is being established which will be wholly online.
- The Course Applicability System (CAS), that facilitates two- to four-year transfers, goes online this spring. CAS is an on-line system in which a student anywhere in the state can enter the courses taken at KCTCS or anywhere else as well as courses the student plans to take, submit those to an institution, and immediately the student will know exactly how those courses transfer into programs at those institutions.
- Structural changes that help students transfer have been created. General education prerequisites are generally considered 48 hours at most institutions. If a general education program is completed at one institution, it has been completed at every institution in the state and can transfer as a block. Parts of the general education program can also be completed and transferred. Students are assured that all the general education pieces transfer. Other structural features such as that are also being put in place in terms of transfer credit programs.
- A large portion of the Go Higher Education Pays campaign will be directed to transfer by doing workshops and seminars around the state with faculty and students talking about CAS, demonstrating how to use that on-line system, promoting transfer, and generally helping students, particularly in the KCTCS, understand the importance and benefits of transfer.
- Interagency collaborations -- The P-16 Council. The Kentucky Department of Education, the Education Professional Standards Board, the Cabinet for Workforce Development, Adult Education, Early Childhood, and the postsecondary system are reviewing various programs to make sure that all work effectively together.

- GEAR UP Kentucky is a federal grant with \$10.5 million of federal money, which is collaboratively matched with \$10.5 million from postsecondary institutions, local school districts, the KDE, and other agencies to target the most economically-disadvantaged middle schools.
- Partnerships – Postsecondary education is working with the schools to improve planning and program organization. One partnership is with Toyota to put Quest programs (professional development for teachers) in schools. Another partnership is with the National Foundation for Teaching of Entrepreneurship by putting on-line resources where teachers can integrate the teaching of core skills in the model of becoming a entrepreneur and these young people put business cases and businesses together. Another partnership is with the Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence focusing on the importance of the family in supporting college-going students. KentuckyEducators.org -- the Virtual University is constructing a partnership with the Education Professional Standards Board to provide on-line assessment and teacher professional development for teachers across our state. The Kentucky Adult Education Website helps train adult educators as well as provides information and learning opportunities for adult learners.
- Many institutions are engaged in partnerships collaborating with the private sector: the incubator work at the ASTeCC (Advanced Science and Technology Communications Center) at UK; the downtown design centers at UK and UofL; METS (the Metropolitan Education and Training Services) where NKU is working with employers and Delta to connect workforce and area economic development needs; the Metropolitan University partnership between UofL and UPS; and ECU's regional community policing institute working to enhance the quality of education available to our public safety people.

Mr. Brundage continued the discussion. Institutions of higher learning are important because of the new and unique role that higher education must play in the economy of the 21st century. Mr. Brundage identified a number of examples of partnerships and projects in the new economy realm.

- The Energy and Environmental Consortium is a program established for building research and development capacity throughout the state.
- Eastern Kentucky University as well as UK, UofL, MuSU, and Ft. Knox, among others, are involved in safety and security issues.
- Innovation and Commercialization Centers, helping entrepreneurs build new companies, are located at several postsecondary education institutions: WKU, MuSU, and UK. There will be 15 satellite operations built around these ICCs that will ultimately be linked with the cooperative extension service, providing technology extension capacity throughout the state.
- There is a technology center program in West Liberty involving UK, MoSU, ECU, and the Office for the New Economy.
- There is an Information Technology task force involving WKU, UK, UofL, NKU, the League of Cities, and the Governor's Office for Technology. This group will eventually design the next generation of Kentucky's Information Highway.

- Assisting existing businesses throughout the state adopt technology is part of the Office for the New Economy's role in creating new businesses. All the universities and the KCTCS are involved.
- ConnectKentucky includes an inventory to determine how every community in the state is networked. There is a three-year plan to get businesses to use the network and to be more sophisticated in their use of the Internet.

Next year a program will be announced involving all universities, the KCTCS, and the private institutions involving summer camps for entrepreneurs and related internships for young people at the research centers and with businesses. K-12 will also be involved.

Mr. Sanders asked about the anticipated use of the ONE bond-pool programs. Mr. Brundage replied that one goal was to build research and development capacity. Bucks for Brains is critical. As top-notch scientists and engineers are brought to Kentucky, more facilities must be built. The universities have found innovative ways with which to build these facilities, but additional bonding authority would certainly help.

Mr. Baker asked about the prospect of more pharmaceutical companies coming to Kentucky. Mr. Brundage replied that the final proposal for a manufacturing facility to be built at Coldstream Research Park was recently approved. The private sector joined in to do the business plan.

A project in northern Kentucky called Kentucky First was recently funded. Kentucky has invested \$500,000 and a group of entrepreneurs have invested \$25 million and are now in the process of looking at companies to bring to Kentucky.

A Natural Products fund that will involve the tobacco research facility at UK is being put together. It will leverage public and private funds to invest in the natural products world and a good bit of that is in pharmaceuticals. A lot is being done in the state right now with the tobacco plant and plans are being made to do something with corn. But capability at the pharmacy school to handle the pharmaceutical part of Natural Products is needed. That is going to be one of the largest industries in the state ten years from now.

Mr. Ford asked how a P-16 council can be started in a community. Mr. Applegate replied that it varies but it could be operated by a KCTCS institution, a local chamber of commerce, or simply organized by interested individuals.

Measuring Up 2002: Sue Hodges Moore, interim president, Council on Postsecondary Education, and Christina Whitfield, associate for research and information, Council on Postsecondary Education, made the presentation.

Ms. Moore reminded the committee that the national report card (Measuring Up 2002) on postsecondary education is a state-by-state analysis, published by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, that was released in October. This report card focuses on the undergraduate level. Kentucky is one of two states (Utah is the other) in

the nation that made progress on all five categories of the 2002 national report card. Kentucky is viewed as being a prototype for coming up with a student-learning grade for all the states.

Ms. Whitfield continued the presentation. The Measuring Up 2002 report is the second iteration; the first was issued in 2000. The Measuring Up project measures states in five broad categories – preparation, participation, affordability, completion, and benefits and uses a number of nationally-recognized indicators in each category to come up with its assessments.

Measuring Up 2002 offers states two kinds of assessment. The first is an analysis of improvement and the second is the issuing of grades to each state based on their current performance compared to all other states. The National Center takes states' raw scores on each indicator and benchmarks them to the performance of the top states and determines a standard that is achievable.

Kentucky's grades improved in three categories – participation, completion, and benefits. While Kentucky's raw scores showed improvement in all categories, that was not the case with Kentucky's grades. In some cases, Kentucky's improvement failed to keep pace with the rate of improvement taking place in other states. Kentucky is featured as a prototype state for the student-learning grade.

Preparation: This category asks if the K-12 system is preparing students for education and training beyond high school. Kentucky was one of only seven states to improve in five indicators highlighted by the National Center as particularly important within that category. There are 12 indicators in total but they extracted seven that they thought were particularly important.

Participation: In this category, Kentucky was one of only seven states to improve in all three measures. The largest gain was in the percentage of working age adults enrolled in postsecondary education -- from 2.4 percent to 2.8 percent on that measurement compared with 5.4 percent for the top states.

Affordability: How affordable is postsecondary education in Kentucky? Kentucky performs quite well on what the National Center calls family ability to pay indicators. **Need-based aid:** The average low-income student in Kentucky receives roughly one-third of their student financial aid from the state as compared to the federal government.

Completion: This seeks to measure if students are making progress through the system and completing degrees. Kentucky's retention rates at the four-year institutions rose to 71 percent in the 2002 report. Graduation rates for students entering college directly from high school improved, but continued to lag behind the top states.

Improved quality of life: Kentucky's economy benefits from its educational attainment levels. The National Center estimates that as a result of the percentage increase of the population holding a baccalaureate degree there has been a 7 percent improvement in the

state's economy and a 3 percent improvement in the state's economy based on the number of people who have some college but are short of a baccalaureate degree.

Learning: No states received a grade in that category. The National Center issued an incomplete to all states in both 2000 and 2002. The National Center has found it very difficult to come up with nationally comparable sets of data to measure this category.

Since the 2000 report, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) has been working to develop an educational capital measurement. Measuring Up 2002 features Kentucky as a prototype state because of its national leadership in a key area of higher education reform.

Kentucky's work with the National Center continues on a student-learning grade. Kentucky will be one of several pilot states featured in the 2004 version of the report and Governor Patton will be convening a meeting of the participating states next year in Kentucky to begin that work.

Ms. Helm expressed concern about need-based financial aid. Ms. Whitfield replied that Kentucky is performing very well at keeping costs low. An important component of this is the KEES program that is part of the family's ability to pay measurement. Kentucky compares well with the top performing states in the need-based aid area.

Council and KHEAA staffs have started a research project trying to estimate the amount of unmet need-based aid in the state.

Mr. Eaglin, Mr. Votruba, and Mr. Ford expressed concern about course taking and that rigorous high school curriculums and senior year curriculums needed to be emphasized.

Mr. Williams asked about the cost implications of prepaid tuition programs. Ms. Moore indicated this topic could possibly be brought to a future SCOPE meeting.

October 15 Prichard Committee Meeting Report: Robert Sexton, executive director, Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence, made the presentation. The Prichard Committee met October 15. The centerpiece of the discussion was a report by Aims McGuinness of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. Several institutional presidents participated in the meeting as did Governor Patton.

Kentucky's postsecondary reform initiative is widely recognized as one of the most far-reaching and significant state-level higher education reforms in the past century in the United States. Kentucky's progress since 1997 has been nothing short of remarkable. It has addressed most of the issues identified just five years earlier and established a foundation for step-by-step progress over the next decade and beyond. The most profound change has been a change in expectations and frame of mind among students, parents, business and civic leaders, postsecondary education leaders, and the Commonwealth's policy leaders. Significant progress has been made in overcoming the six policy barriers that were identified in 1997. The most important has been the shift

from an agenda driven by institutional interest to one driven by a larger, statewide public agenda.

Positives –

Postsecondary education has been at the top of the public agenda. The CPE has emerged as one of the most respected policy leadership and coordinating boards of postsecondary education in the nation because of the vision, creativity, and quality of its work.

- Kentucky had the fifth highest increase in per capita income among the states.
- Kentucky had one of the highest rates of reduction in the percentage of the adult population who do not have a high school diploma.
- Kentucky made dramatic gains from 1994 to 2000 in the percentage of recent high school graduates going directly to college.
- Enrollment increased by 19.9 percent increase.
- The percentage of people getting a GED increased.
- Retention and completion rates are good.

Negatives –

- Kentucky ranks near the bottom in the percentage of population with only a bachelors degree.
- The gap between the state's performance and the nation at large remains significant. Kentucky was 42nd in the nation in the six-year graduation rate category for full-time students in baccalaureate programs. Kentucky was 44th in the nation in graduation rates for two-year institutions.
- The reform has not yet had a significant impact on the number of degrees granted.
- While Kentucky is making progress, it will take a sustained commitment to raise the standard of living to levels at or above the national average. The danger is that temporary setbacks or failure to demonstrate short-term results will lead to discouragement and cynicism about reform.

Challenges/concerns:

- One challenge will be to counter the possible drifting back to competition among institutional interests as opposed to a focus on state interests and to keep the emphasis on step-by-step measurable progress toward the long-term goal of raising Kentucky's standard of living to the national average or above.
- Business support needs to be broadened and deepened. There is concern about the lack of engagement by the General Assembly and the state's business and civic communities. SCOPE has not been as effective as hoped in developing legislative partnership for the agenda. SCOPE can work provided that a more deliberate effort is made to listen and to engage legislative leaders.
- A core leadership group that is deeply committed to the goals of HB 1 and reform is important. Reform is difficult to sustain when changes in political leadership

occur unless there is a strong, independent voice of support from the state's business and civic community.

- Engaging institutional leaders -- both presidents and governing boards -- in collective responsibility to sustain reform is important. A debate among institutions is important but once a final decision is made, it is critical to the reform process that the council and the presidents stand together throughout the legislative process.
- Sustaining the link between financing policy and the strategic agenda -- The HB 1 budget structure embodied in the two biennial appropriation bills to date are fundamentally sound; however, Kentucky, like most states, now faces a severe and, most likely, protracted period of budget challenges. The most important message that NCHEMS can convey is that even in the direst financial circumstances, Kentucky must sustain state funding for both the base and performance/incentive funding. A failure to invest consistently at least a small percentage of the total operating budget appropriation in incentive trust funds to support change will doom the reform process. Without incentives/performance funding, the CPE will have virtually no effective policy levers to advance the strategic agenda except the relatively weak tools of an appeal to public opinion and the use of the regulatory authority.
- Strategic leadership and governance -- In such a decentralized system, success depends fundamentally on the quality of institutional boards. The need to maintain the quality of university board appointments and to strengthen the means for the CPE to hold boards accountable for both effective governance and support for the statewide strategic agenda is important.
- Clarifying the role and mission of the comprehensive universities -- The diversity of missions among the institutions is in sharp contrast to the "one size fits all" message conveyed by being lumped into a single category in HB 1. Any change should underscore the differences among the institutions and the distinctive ways in which they contribute to the regions and the Commonwealth as a whole.
- There is concern about weak incentives to encourage collaboration among institutions. There is evidence of lack of collaboration having to do with comparatively low transfer rates from the KCTCS to the universities.
- New emphasis on recognizing the role of independent higher education -- Reform implementation appears to have proceeded with only limited consideration of the impact on the independent institutions.
- Support for reform remains strong even among some who were considered to be skeptics or opponents, but reform is fragile and Kentucky is at a critical transition point.
- The Prichard Committee passed a resolution at its October meeting emphasizing the need to keep pushing forward. The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Governor and the General Assembly for its continued commitment and also pledged its continuing efforts to support that commitment. The Prichard Committee urged the continuation of financial support including Bucks for Brains and encouraged collaboration and cooperation among institutions of higher education so that a genuine system of postsecondary education can be created. The Prichard Committee may reconstitute its postsecondary education group.

Ms. Luallen commented that these are valuable measurements to have made against other institutions and other states. They are not necessarily measured against the specifics of the bill but, in fact, what kind of progress Kentucky is making.

Ms. Miller suggested that, once the Prichard Committee has had time to thoroughly examine the report, Mr. Sexton should be asked to report back to SCOPE.

Report from the Institutions: Mr. Todd, president, University of Kentucky, and convener of the Conference of Presidents, gave the report.

All the presidents signed a letter supporting the NCHEMS report.

Kentucky needs to be at or above the national average by 2020. Benefits are being seen already – 31,500 more students have enrolled in postsecondary education in the last five years and student retention and graduation rates are both improving.

The presidents are united behind HB 1. Momentum has to be sustained even in these financially tough times. Across the country, Kentucky is viewed as a model because of, for example, programs such as the Kentucky Virtual University and Bucks for Brains.

Bucks for Brains is a resounding success. Through its first two rounds, the state has provided \$230 million for endowments that the institutions have matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis. Internationally known researchers are being attracted. With the Bucks for Brains enhancement, some of Kentucky's best and brightest will be retained. The Bucks for Brains faculty bring substantial federal contracts and grant monies into the state and each research dollar is multiplied by the economic impact it generates. In addition, this program fosters an atmosphere of entrepreneurial growth that results in significant increases in the number of business ventures emerging from our new patents and our new technologies. All of the presidents agree that a third round of the Endowment Match program, or Bonds for Brains, is a top priority for the upcoming biennium.

Because of enrollment growth, the institutions have significant capital needs. The debt service on the agency bonds will be a cost borne by supporting auxiliary enterprises of the universities such as housing and dining. The council recommends a \$100 million agency bond pool for 2002-2004. Needs continue to grow, primarily driven by the enrollment. The institutional presidents ask that an agency bond pool at least at the council-requested level be provided for the upcoming biennium.

Times are tough, but now is not the time to slow down. There is a mandate in the 31,500 new students who expect to have competitive jobs. There is a mandate from those researchers who have been attracted and retained within the walls of the universities and laboratories that will compete with the best and the brightest out there. There is a mandate for some of those people who have lost their old economy jobs, who don't know where they are headed, and who don't know where their children's jobs are coming from.

Kentucky can continue to pass other states, but cutting needed investments won't get us there – there needs to be new revenue.

The presidents appreciate the financial support, the vision, and the commitment to postsecondary education. It is Kentucky's future and it has to continue.

Mr. Williams was concerned about federal funds being used as matching monies in the Bucks for Brains program. Ms. Moore replied that the purpose of Bucks for Brains is to bring in private sector money, but the council's guidelines also allow for bringing in other types of resources into Kentucky and that includes federal funds. If a federal program allows for an endowment type investment, then that would qualify under the council's guidelines.

Mr. Williams asked if the federal program would have to require a local match and if the institution was going to get it anyway, would it be able to use that to match Bucks for Brains. Ms. Moore replied that under the current guidelines, it does not require an additional local match. So the federal dollars constitute an institutional match.

Mr. Williams would like to the council to look into that issue and requested that the chairmen of the Appropriations and Revenue Committee and the Education Committee in the legislature look into this issue.

Mr. Sanders commented that almost twice as much brick and mortar could be created if those projects were bonded than to bond the Bucks for Brains program. He suggested that this group needs to discuss that issue.

State Revenue Report: James Ramsey, president, University of Louisville, and former State Budget Director, began the presentation. Kentucky had 18 years of strong economic growth from the mid-1980s through November 2000. In November 2000, Kentucky began to see a job loss, particularly in durable manufacturing jobs. The period 2000-02 has not seen any significant improvement in the state economy. Between November 2000 through 2002, Kentucky continued to lose manufacturing jobs. Weak consumer confidence and weak corporate profits have been very significant problems. Businesses have been struggling and, as a result, are not investing.

Mary Lassiter, acting State Budget Director, continued the presentation. Kentucky had a budget shortfall of approximately 2.7 percent in 2001 and a budget shortfall of almost 9.5 percent in 2002. There was no legislatively-enacted budget this year, but the current spending plan in place would have required 6.2 percent revenue growth in the current year and 4.1 percent growth for 2004.

FY 2002 was the first time in history, which can be documented, where less General Fund revenue was collected in one year than the year before.

FY 2001 -- There were budget cuts, but no cuts to education. Of the total \$185 million budget shortfall, most of the money came from one-time sources and there were not any serious programmatic cuts.

FY 2002 -- There was a \$687 million budget shortfall. \$231 million of that total involved cuts to programs. Postsecondary education took a 2 percent cut, but most state government programs were not significantly impacted.

Now, in FY 2003, the one-time monies are gone and the budget reserve trust fund has been depleted.

Funds have been captured that were intended for other uses and they may have longer-term implications to be concerned about. The culmination of all these issues resulted in a downgrade in Kentucky's credit rating from Standard & Poors (S&P), a major credit rating agency, from an AA to AA-, which takes it back to where it was in the early to mid-1990s. It is still a good credit rating but it is not as good as it had been.

Other states are going through many of the same things, but Kentucky is at a critical crossroads. FY 2003 receipts to date have grown 6.8 percent over FY 2002. 6.2 percent growth is needed to finance the spending plan, but one-time tax amnesty money clouds the growth rate. So while there has been strong revenue growth through the first quarter, it has been inflated by amnesty revenue.

The Consensus Forecasting Group (CFG) finalized its numbers as reported in the press last Friday. The CFG is calling for revenue growth of 3.2 percent in FY 2003, 3.9 percent in FY 2004, and 5.3 percent in FY 2005 and FY 2006.

As a result, the revenue side of the budget now shows a total revenue shortfall of \$199 million in this fiscal year and \$203 million in FY 2004. This is revenue side only of the budget equation.

On the spending side of the budget, the Department of Education is experiencing a budget shortfall in the current year. The assessed value of property is coming in less than estimated so the projected numbers there indicate a shortfall in the education budget of approximately \$55-60 million.

Thus far, about \$120 million in resources have been identified to apply toward the problem. The money budgeted for campaign finance funds will not be spent -- \$7 million in the first year and \$2 million in the second. That is a resource now available. It is now estimated that the Commonwealth is about \$144 million short in the current year and about \$365 million short next year.

There are also budget shortfalls in both the Corrections Department and Medicaid program and other expenditure pressures as well.

Ms. Luallen said that the Governor will start meeting with legislative leaders, gubernatorial candidates, the press, and the editorial boards of the major newspapers to get all the numbers and facts out about exactly what the situation is and then begin a dialogue on what possible options there might be to deal with the budget problem.

Ms. Lassiter explained further that the \$120 million that was budgeted as a beginning fund balance coming into the year can be used as a resource. A fund balance that was anticipated to be carried forward into next year's budget – that was captured as a resource.

Mr. Owen asked how many states have been put on watch and had their credit downgraded. Ms. Lassiter thought S&P had 15 states on a watch list. Forty-six out of 50 states experienced revenue shortfalls in FY 2002

Ms. Luallen added that Medicaid numbers are not being counted as part of the overall shortfall because they will be dealt with in the Medicaid budget.

Mr. Barrows suggested that the presidents and council should concentrate on how to make cuts in their current-year budgets as they inevitably will be asked to do.

Mr. Todd replied that the CPE had already requested the presidents to prepare calculations for a 3 percent cut. Something else that's needed is to sell the momentum of what has been accomplished in education in Kentucky and sell the path Kentucky is on to try to improve this state. If we go through this period and don't find some new revenue, then we have shrunk from the responsibility that we have to show the state of Kentucky to keep us on this path. Leadership is taking people to where they need to be whether they realize it or not.

Mr. Eaglin added that to get through this we really have to rely on the professional judgments of the leaders of each institution, in cooperation with CPE and the legislature.

2004-06 Council on Postsecondary Education Budget Process Timetable: Ms. Moore suggested that this item be deferred to a SCOPE meeting next year. Ms. Moore pointed out some preliminary work on the budget process has begun and council staff is working closely with the chief budget officers on the campuses and with the presidents.

Proposed Calendar Year 2003 SCOPE Meeting Dates: The tentative calendar year 2003 SCOPE meeting dates are as follows: March 3, June 9, September 8, and December 8.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m. (ET).